

REMARKS

Claims 1, 17, 29, and 50-58 are currently amended. Claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, 38-39, and 50-58 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

5

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the time that Examiner Ries spent on the telephone discussing this application on August 9, 2007.

During the interview, Applicant's Attorney and Examiner Ries discussed
10 the 103 rejections under Adams in view of Vasters. Examiner Ries agreed with Applicant's Attorney that neither Adams nor Vasters appeared to teach the "two-way" interaction between an input and output document that Applicant's specification contemplates. Examiner Ries, however, requested that Applicant amend the claims to more clearly define what is meant by the term "references"
15 and that doing so would likely make all of the claims allowable over the combination of Adams and Vasters.

Applicant maintains that the claims are allowable as written, but in the interest of advancing prosecution, and guided by Examiner Ries's suggestion, amends independent claims 1, 17, and 29 to recite that "the references provide
20 *pointers* that *link* the parts of the output document with the parts of the input document." Applicant notes that independent claims 30, 31, and 34 already recite this notion of pointers. As an example of the current amendments, claim 1 now recites:

25 A method for mapping between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document, the input document pertaining to a first kind of document, and the output document pertaining to a second kind of document, comprising:

- providing a translation file that converts documents of the first kind to
30 documents of the second kind;

- in a first phase, modifying the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships between parts of documents of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind, the first phase producing a modified translation file;
- 5 • in a second phase, using the modified translation file to convert the input document into the output document, including:
 - activating the mapping functionality; and
 - using the mapping functionality to provide references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document, ***wherein the references provide pointers that link the parts of the output document with the parts of the input document.***

This amendment makes it clear that there are ***pointers*** placed in the output document that link back to the input document. Support for this amendment may be found throughout Applicant's specification, including **Fig. 6**, which depicts a pointer placed in a node of an output document that links back to a node in the input document.

In the prior art, as depicted in Fig. 1 of Applicant's disclosure (and described in Applicant's background section), an XSLT processor receives an XML document and transforms this document into a transformed document, such as HTML. But "conventional XSLT does not also provide a mechanism for translating the transformed document back into the XML document from which it derived." (See Background Section of Applicant's Specification.) In other words, in the prior art the transformation is strictly "***one-way***". But many applications require "***two-way***" interaction between an XML document and a transformed document, such as HTML.

As recited in claim 1, Applicant's disclosure remedies this problem by "***modifying the translation file*** to include mapping functionality" and "using the mapping functionality to provide references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document, ***wherein the references provide pointers that link parts of the output document with parts of the input document.***"

Adams, the reference cited by the Office, teaches the use of the “BizTalk Mapper”, which employs a simple drag-and-drop paradigm to allow a user to create a standard XSLT transformation style sheet: “to enable the use of the map...the map must be compiled into an Internet standard document called an Extensible Stylesheet Language Transformations (XSLT) file.” (See Adams, page 110.) In other words, Adams only teaches the **creation** of a translation file. Once created, Adam’s XSLT file is never **modified**, as claimed.

Furthermore, Adams teaches directly away from the very purpose of the claims by stating that “the mapping is **one way only**, from left to right. If a reverse map is needed from the output format to the input format, a separate map must be created with the input and output exchanging positions.” (See Adams, page 112, emphasis added.) As discussed above, this is the exact problem that Applicant’s disclosure remedies. Accordingly, Applicant submits that in light of the current amendments, all of the claims are allowable as written.

Applicant greatly appreciates Examiner Ries’s willingness to assist Applicant in advancing prosecution. Examiner Ries indicated that she would call Applicant to discuss the amendments to the claims in the event that she felt the current amendments failed to distinguish the claims from the combination of Adams and Vasters.

Claim Objections

The claims have been objected to for omitting claim number 50 from the listing of claims. Applicant notes that in the last response, new claims 51-59 should have been numbered 50-58. Applicant amended claims 51-59 to read as claims 50-58. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out this error.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, 38-39, and 40-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Adams, “BizTalk Unleashed”

(“Adams”) in view of Vasters, “BizTalk Server 2000 A Beginner’s Guide” (“Vasters”). As discussed above, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Conclusion

5 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office’s next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

10

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 14 September 2007

By: /Michael K. Colby/
Michael K. Colby
Reg. No. 45,816
(509) 755-7254

15